DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 403 060 PS 024 975

AUTHOR Singer, Elly
TITLE Children, Parents and Caregivers: Three Views of Care and Education.
PUB DATE 96
NOTE 13p.; In: "Childhood Education: International Perspectives," see PS 024 960.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Caregiver Child Relationship; Caregiver Role; *Childhood Attitudes; Day Care; *Early Childhood Education; Educational Research; Foreign Countries; *Parent Attitudes; *Research Needs; Research Problems; *Teacher Attitudes; *Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Caregiver Attitudes; Caregiver Behavior; Netherlands; Parent Caregiver Relationship

ABSTRACT

For too long, researchers and policy makers have considered themselves to be the only experts able to define quality in child care. That children, parents, and teachers have their own expertise in this area is often denied. This article explores the points of view of these three parties and attempts to demonstrate that researchers must be prepared to have their academic theories turned upside down. The article begins with children's perspective on quality child care as expressed through the voice of 13-year-old Maarten. His opinion that caregivers should simply do things they enjoy and allow children to participate or not, as they choose, has major implications for developmental psychology's emphasis on exclusive attention to the child. Conclusions can also be drawn about children's desire to be included in the adult world and about their recognition of the power inequality between themselves and adults (a fact often overlooked by developmental psychologists). The article's second section explores parents' perspective, such as their desire for child caregiving that minimizes family stress, takes a personal approach, and allows them equal footing with caregivers. Finally, the article presents the caregivers' perspective, pointing out the limited applicability of much research that has focused on caregiver-child dyads: day care workers are often responsible for 12 to 14 children. It concludes with a call to researchers to relinquish their claim to superiority and to begin work on new context-bound theories that incorporate the interested parties' points of view. Contains 28 references. (EV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 403 060

CHILDREN, PARENTS AND CAREGIVERS: THREE VIEWS OF CARE AND EDUCATION

Elly Singer
University of Utrecht
Utrecht, The Netherlands

Introduction

Most people judge the quality of child care on the basis of the well being of the children and parents involved. Are the children happy and lively? Do the parents feel welcome? And does the day care centre help to reduce the stress produced by combining work and children? They also look at the caregivers. Do they look friendly and do they behave with enthusiasm towards the children? In everyday life good quality means a good cooperation between the three parties directly involved: the children, parents and teachers. But very little research has been carried out into this cooperation. What exactly goes on in child care situations is, for most researchers, still a black box.

For too long researchers and policy makers have considered themselves to be the only 'experts' able to define quality in child care (Moss & Pence, 1994; Singer, 1992, 1993). That children, parents and teachers have their own expertise in this area is often denied. Without justification, as I hope to show in this introduction. Without listening to the three parties directly involved, research will remain superficial: it will not touch on the subjects of real importance. However, in order to be able to listen, researchers will have to put their own way of thinking, including the accepted theories, into perspective. Because children, parents and teachers can and most probably will upset all sorts of academic theories taken for granted up to now.

PS 024 975

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Eila Estola
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The children

I will start with the children. All children have ideas about education. And some children, like some adults, even have a clear theory. One of these children is Maarten. Maarten is a Dutch boy aged thirteen. He lives with four brothers and sisters with a friend of mine. Recently Maarten asked me what sort of work I did. I told him that I thought about the way we could take good care of children while their parents are working. But it's great when they're not there, was his first reaction. He was probably thinking back to his very bad experiences with parents and foster parents.

I tried to defend my work, and said: young children can't take care of themselves. Maarten agreed with me, but he couldn't understand why one had to think about it for so long: after all it wasn't difficult! I asked him how it should be done. Well he said, if you're looking after children you should just do something you enjoy doing yourself, build aeroplanes or something (that's what he enjoys doing). Then the children come and watch, ask questions or want to help. If they get bored with that after a while, they go and play together, and if they need something you just go and help them. That was all according to Maarten.

For a moment I was really surprised by his answer. He said exactly the opposite to that which is generally accepted in developmental psychology: no exclusive attention for the child, but just doing *what you enjoy*. However, thinking about it I realized there was more in it than I first thought. Maarten pointed out something that I know from my own experience and research: namely that most children want a feeling of togetherness and want to join in with adults. If a teacher starts enthusiastically to make things from clay, a few minutes later she will have a group of curious toddlers around her. There's nothing more exciting than a group of workmen breaking the street up outside the house. Children are extremely interested in the life and work of adults. For instance, Rheingold (1982) and Beach (1988) found that toddlers help their parents spontaneously with dusting, washing up, cooking and other household chores. The children do not feel as though they are playing, as far as they are concerned they are working. Tizard & Hughes (1984) found that this adult environment at home encouraged the children to question their mother about what she was doing and about family events etc.

In mainstream developmental theories such as the attachment theory, the young child is seen as being disconnected from the social context in which it lives together with adults. Theoretical concepts such as the responsiveness of the upbringer, are based implicitly on the assumption that children need separate attention. This separation of children is a typically western phenomenon. It is connected to industrialization, separation of paid work outside the home and family, and the development of separate institutions for children, such as child care centres and schools. According to Kessen (1983), developmental psychology has developed from this western culture where

children are seen as a separate category. In turn, developmental psychology influences the way children are treated in our culture. For instance, by studying the interactions between mother and child separated from the household work done by mothers. This means that we lose sight of the basic insight at the theoretical level, that children want to grow up. And by growing up, Maarten means learning by joining in with adults.

Maarten therefore disagreed entirely with my view that young children learn by playing. According to him, playing is having fun, a good romp or playing a game. A child playing with bricks isn't actually playing, he's thinking hard and learning. According to Maarten, his four year old brother agrees with him.

Maarten is full of criticism of adults who do not take enough care, with the result that children have accidents or are abused without anyone intervening. As far as he is concerned, taking good care of children primarily involves eating, drinking and safety, and being there if the child needs you. This concept is a long way from the way in which 'sensitive responsivity' is operationalized in research. Researchers analyse the subtieties in the ongoing interactions between mother and child. Maartens talks about the results: are caregivers trustworthy. Perhaps lots of young children think in this basic way about the trustworthiness and love of adults. After all, the results of meta-analyses of research into the connection between the sensitivity of parents and the safe bonding of children show that this connection only exists to a small degree: on average not more than 0.16 (Goldsmith & Alansky, 1987).

According to Maarten, children do not need continuous attention from adults. He says that is 'interfering'. According to him you can see that adults often don't enjoy playing with children. As an example of this he mentions the play therapy he had to undergo. "You have to sit in a cage or small room and play with them, but you can tell they don't enjoy it because they talk in that silly way." He doesn't say anything more then, because you can tell the adults just talk *about* you.

Maarten wants adults to think together *with* children. If something goes wrong the adults can advise the children and tell them why they think something is a good idea and make plans. Only if something is dangerous should they say that something *must* be done. But instead of this, adults are always making up rules and being bossy. Maarten says that this scares children, because they might do everything wrong.

Maarten makes a clear distinction between what children share with one another and what they share with adults. He thinks that adults underestimate children. In this he is supported by researchers like Musatti & Mueller (1985), Corsaro & Emiliani (1992) and Stambok & Verba (1986). They studied the cultures that children create with one another in Italian and French crèches. Like Maarten, they give examples of the way young children communicate with each other non-verbally, make rules together, negotiate and make jokes. 'Pretend play' is the way slightly older children get to grips with the big adult

world and all its puzzles at their own level (Fein, 1989). Equality like this cannot be offered by adults.

This puts the one-sided emphasis of researchers on the mother or caregiver/child relationship more into perspective. This one-sided emphasis on the mother probably says more about adult values in our culture rather than the children's.

Maarten considers constant attention from adults to be 'interfering'. Stambok & Verba (1986) also show that teachers who react to all children's signals disturb the children's play with one another. The children then become more orientated towards the teacher than to one another. Generally speaking, it is sufficient for young children to have eye contact with the caregiver or teacher. They then know that they are seen and that the teacher thinks they can manage on their own.

Research into children's own opinion of child care is still scarce. Instead of being asked about things, they are more often observed, like Maarten in the play therapy room. However, there are exceptions. For instance in Denmark it has been established that children are entitled to their own opinion (Langsted, 1994). Within the child care world this has given rise to projects in order to find out what children think of their daily life. In one project 13 and 14 year olds studied what 3 to 5 year olds have to say about kindergarten. After a two day visit to a kindergarten, they returned with a list of examples of abuse of children's rights. They asked the teachers critical questions like: why do adults get coffee and tea between meals, and are the children only allowed to drink water from the tap? Why are children only allowed to eat at mealtimes and not whenever they are hungry? Why must children play outside if they would rather play inside, just because adults think it's healthier for them? They gave many examples of the unequal rights for children and unnecessary interference by adults, that Maarten finds so annoying.

In another project teachers took a critical look at the rules they had established in the day care centre for children from 6 months to 3 years of age. They discovered that they often tried to regulate the children's behaviour by forbidding things. Once they gave the children the right to say 'no', a great number of rules turned out to be unnecessary. Only the rules directly involved with safety were maintained. The result was that fewer conflicts arose between teachers and children. However, there were more conflicts amongst the children. But this is seen as the children's right to solve their own conflicts, and in most cases they are well able to do this (Langsted, 1994).

We know very little about children's views on their upbringing, but it seems to me quite probable that the central concepts they use to evaluate quality differ substantially from those of mainstream developmental psychologists. Probably:

* Children place give central place to the inequality of power between adults and children and unfairness between them; something not mentioned by developmental psychology. From their perspective they

have to deal with giants. Giants they love and need, but who nevertheless also control their lives.

- Children think in a more differentiated way about their relationship with their parents, caregivers and teachers than developmental psychologists. They want to grow up, learn from adults and think with them, and not be excluded from the adult world. Or, to mention a developmental psychologist in support of their viewpoint: as Vygotsky states, they need a 'zone of proximal development'. Further, they want to be well taken care of, they want to be safe. But they do not want adults to keep on being so bossy and interfering with everything.
- Children want to be taken seriously. They do not only play, they work as well; learning is an enormous effort. Contacts with children have their own value, different to those with adults. Other children are partners at their own level to fight with, to look at, to share their jokes and curiosity.

The parents

Now the parents' perspective. The child care demands of parents have generated little interest from developmental psychologists, specifically in countries with a poor child care policy (Larner & Phillips, 1994; Singer, 1992, 1993). I'm thinking here of countries such as the United States, the United Kingdom and my own country, the Netherlands. As I showed elsewhere, mainstream developmental theories, concepts and research questions are deeply anchored in the moral and social-political choices and problems of the middle class (Singer, 1992, 1993). In the above mentioned countries, this has meant that developmental theories were, and to some extent still are, rooted in a pedagogic concept of a family upbringing with the mother at home. Traditionally, child care outside the home was only recommended when mothers were considered lacking in some way, for instance in families from lower social classes and ethnic minorities: professional care had to compensate for the deficiency of the home upbringing.

This resulted in two research streams which dominated ideas about child care for a long time. On one side there was research into the negative effects of child care on the emotional development and the mother-child relationship. This was used in discussions about the right of middle class mothers to work outside the home. On the other side there was research into the positive effects on the cognitive development if it concerned children from disadvantaged families participating in intervention programmes. This research had to prove the superiority of professional care. In both research streams the effects of day care were measured on the basis of standards generated in the study of middle class home-reared children. In both re-

search streams the values, standards and child care needs of parents were ignored.

There was complete indifference to the stress within families as a result of the lack of good child care facilities outside the home, and for the risks that children run of having overtired parents, changing forms of care and bad experiences with childminders or teachers. In this way child-aimed interests are made to oppose the child care needs of the parents. Even those in favour of child care outside the home, such as Clarke-Stewart, Scarr or Phillips, were, for a long time, forced to spend a great deal of their research time on proving that child care was not something morally reprehensible.

However, the indifference towards what parents want is also connected to scientific philosophy. Developmental psychologists all too often started from the presupposition that, on the basis of their superior and universal knowledge of the child, they were the only ones qualified to make statements about what was good for the 'normal' development of the child (Kessen, 1983; Singer, 1992, 1993). They were not aware of the value-basis of their theories I mentioned earlier. They were the 'experts' and parents were supposed to be in need of their knowledge, and not the other way round. In this scientific tradition the parents' and children's needs and knowledge could be ignored.

During the past fifteen years, a new stream of research has started: the question of quality has become central, and more attention is being paid to what parents want. Through this, it has become apparent just how far away scientific thinking is from parents' thinking, especially because of the presupposed superiority of expert knowledge (Larner & Phillips, 1994; Singer, 1991; Singer & Miltenburg, 1994). I will give a few examples.

Research into quality was first directed towards structural characteristics such as group size, caregivers' or teachers' level of training and so on. This is important for establishing minimum licensing requirements. But apparently parents seldom look at structural characteristics. For instance, many Dutch and American parents are not interested in diplomas, that is in expert knowledge. According to them you can't teach somebody to love children. Above all they want someone who has a personal interest in them and their child. Only when the child is two or three years old do parents attach more value to education and diplomas.

Another example: until recently research concentrated mainly on day care centres with fully trained teachers. But many parents prefer informal care by family, friends or childminders nearby, especially for babies (Van Dijke, Terpstra & Hermanns, 1994). For example Dutch parents think that the childminders' approach is more personal and that they are more flexible with regard to the parents' wishes.

Because Dutch experts can only think of parents in need of experts' guidance, much emphasis is placed on parent education and support in the upbringing from child day care centres. But parents appear to value the support of the teachers more as a discussion between a colleague upbringer. They don't want experts who stand above them (Singer, 1991). Dutch and American parents also apparently prefer to ask advice from someone they

trust from their immediate environment rather than from experts (Larner & Phillips, 1994). Besides that, Dutch parents also want teachers to listen to their advice on handling their child.

The question of daily separations of infant from mother also appears in a different light in research amongst parents. Separation anxiety is a problem of children *and* their parents and not only the children (Hock, McBride & Gnezda, 1989). Parents often suffer more from the fear of separation than the children, especially if the children are still very young and they would have preferred to look after the child themselves. In our research among Dutch parents, we found that parents more often had problems getting used to the separation if the children were younger than seven months old, and the children had more problems if they were older than seven months (Singer, 1991). But, if the parents really support their choice, nearly all the children soon get used to child care outside the home.

There is apparently a diversity of value orientations among parents. But very often practical factors are decisive (Van Dijke, Terpstra & Hermanns, 1994). A great many parents have no choice after all, and are happy if they can find day care that fits in with their working hours and where the children are happy.

To summarize:

* In the first place parents probably look for care that will minimize the family stress caused by combining work and children.
* Particularly if the children are still very young, they want a personal approach and individual interest in their child.
* Parents want the opportunity to discuss things on an equal footing with a colleague-upbringer: teacher.

The caregivers

Finally the caregivers' perspective. The task they face is to build up a relationship and work together with possibly as many as 36 young children, if children come part-time to the care centre as is often the case in the Netherlands. Behind all these children are one or two parents who also require personal contact, and a good link up between the care given in the day care situation and the care at home. Caregivers are faced with the task of forming a community with all these children and the adults.

The complex network of relationships is a far cry from the mother-child dyad mainly studied by researchers. This limits the applicability of the scientific knowledge for caregivers in child centres and family day care. This wouldn't be such a problem if the researchers explicated the social context of their theories. But the attachment theory or the Piagetian theory for instance, claim universal validity: in theory, statements are made about natural laws in the development of all children, no matter what the social

context in which they grow up. Caregivers trying to apply such theories in their situation are set off on the wrong foot.

Take for instance the presupposition that caregivers should be sensitive and responsive to the signals of individual children for their feeling of safety. A demand like this in a group of 14 toddlers leads to very short and superficial contacts between the teacher and child. For example, Hutt et al. (1989) found that in English nursery schools the contact between teacher and child lasted on average no longer the three quarters of a minute each time.

Particularly those children in need of extra attention will suffer from this individualistic and teacher-centred approach. Without an understanding and appreciation of group processes between young children, caregivers or teachers experience every extra child in the group as an extra burden. They lose the overall picture, and the result is that a few noticeable children are picked out for the individual attention: we are talking here about negative attention. For example, Swaders (1995) studied a change in group size from 7 to 8 children. When the group becomes larger, the teachers become significantly more negative and controlling towards the children who were specially placed because they were in a so-called 'high risk group'. This, while the 'high-risk' children's behaviour didn't change.

There is quite a lot of research which shows that teachers, probably due to helplessness tend to misuse their power with regard to so-called problem children. Examples are: doing too many things for handicapped children so they don't get the chance to do things for themselves; ignoring quiet introvert children; and particularly giving aggressive children negative and disciplinary attention (Tari et al., 1989).

It is also untrue that all children are better off in small groups with more attention from the teacher. For instance, Homans (1995) found that hyper-active children with little concentration are interested in something for longer when they just play in the group, than if they only have to share the teacher's attention with one other child. There are even studies which show that the smaller the group the more interfering the teacher, and the smaller the group the more children there are who show anxious bonding behaviour (Phillips et al., 1987).

In my view, interference by caregivers is related to a lack of theories about, and appreciation of what young children learn from and share with one another. Caregivers or teachers have a great deal of direct and indirect influence on how children play together: by the way they design the environment and the play and work material they offer. It is the teacher's decision whether the children play undisturbed and whether to give a new impulse to the game. With regard to this, it is a good idea to remember Maarten's advice about doing something you enjoy. A day care centre is a world created especially for children, which lacks the challenges taken for granted in an environment where adults also live and work. Teachers have to consciously make the opening into the adult world. By making music or painting; by organising excursions or inviting other people in. They also can involve the

older children with the care of the babies, and encourage contact between children and household staff. The latter happens in Italian crèches where the woman working in the kitchen and doing household chores often fulfils a sort of granny role (Corsaro & Emiliani, 1992).

Encouraging children involves not only actively asking questions or setting them to work, but also doing something exciting and interesting which will make the children start asking questions. The latter is a very stimulating way of starting up conversations. Tizard & Hughes (1984) found that teachers generally take the initiative to talk; they will ask a pedagogical question about something the child is doing; the child gives a short answer; end of conversation. A real exchange rarely took place. It is difficult, for adults as well, to answer questions *about* something in which you are totally involved. A perspective change, from 'being involved' to 'reflection about', is something we should not ask of children. The few real conversations observed by Tizard & Hughes (1984) took place when the teacher was busy doing something and the children asked questions out of curiosity.

What caregivers need are theories based on their work situation, that give answers to questions such as: how do you help children to feel safe in a group when a non-parent is looking after them? What do children learn from one another and when do they need an adult there? How do you prevent formation of a sterile, boring, child world? How can you analyse the effect of power between the adults and children and between the children themselves?

These theories should concern not only children, but also the parents. Caregivers must pioneer in this field as well. After all, traditionally the professional caregiver is someone who is hierarchically above the parents; this is also a heritage of the previously mentioned scientific philosophy. Parents took their children to professional upbringers when their child needed education (the teacher), or if there were problems in the upbringing (the therapist or social worker). But, in child day care, the parents' interests must be taken directly into account, for instance their working hours.

Shared care of very young children requires consultation and adaptability, in which values and standards often play a role which is difficult to define. Dutch child care centres are often not adapted to parents' involvement (Singer & Miltenburg, 1994). Within professional institutions it is apparently difficult to evaluate one's own professional perspective.

Luckily, there is a great deal of action in this area, at the international level as well. In many different countries experiments are being carried out into new consultation forms and ways of linking up to the various cultural backgrounds of diverse groups of parents. However, the fact remains that this pioneering work in countries like the Netherlands is, to a great extent, taking place without the help or support of theories from the scientific world.

Thinking together

I started this introduction by pointing out that what exactly goes on in child care is to a large degree like a black box for researchers. I have tried to clarify that researchers will never understand anything about the daily practice of child care as long as they are not open to the perspectives of the children, parents and caregivers involved. In other words:

1. The claim of superiority must be relinquished. Psychologists must explicate their own values and standards, and place themselves at the service of the parents, caregivers and children.

2. Work must begin on (new) context-bound theories that offer an insight into development processes under new pedagogic conditions of shared care for children.

3. The children's, parents' and caregivers' own theories deserve recognition and further empirical research into their tenability. A way must be found to link these theories or perspectives, without allowing any one of them to become dominant.

Relinquishing the claim to superiority is also important for the relationships between experts. For instance, Helen Penn (1994) gives an almost dramatic report of how this narrow minded view of 'what is good for the child' among Scottish politicians and professionals working in nursery schools, day care centres and family day care led to an endless conflict, and eventually to her resigning her position. A more coherent approach to early childhood services Helen Penn worked on, broke down as the result of conflicts arising from different values, traditions and perceived interests. When experts and politicians get lost in arguments, parents and their children are always the losers. Unfortunately, the situation described by Helen Penn is all too familiar to me, and I think that goes for many people working for any length of time in child care.

I look with a certain amount of jealousy at countries where a basic 'yes' has been said at the political level to various forms of care and education of young children. I'm thinking particularly of Northern Italy and the Scandinavian countries, and in some ways also of the former East Germany (Melhuish & Moss, 1991; Moss & Pence, 1994). What I notice specifically is that a political decision precedes scientific research. Because a real choice is made for specific forms of care, people can actually start to work on them. Sometimes, as in Italy, with a great deal of parental involvement right from the start. Only then do the research questions arise, together with practical questions and the goals one wishes to attain. Psychologists can then play an important supportive and innovative role. In the development of the so-called Reggio-pedagogics, Musatti for instance played an important part through her research in children's' relationships with one another. In this way context-bound theories are developed within a normative framework shared

by all involved; theories which, by the way, have received international acclaim.

But, just as important in my view, is the research carried out by the Danish children I mentioned earlier and the advice of children like Maarten. In order to open the black box of child care, all involved must be heard: thinking together as Maarten calls it. I share this ideal with him.

References

Beach, B.A. (1988) Children at work: The home workplace. In: *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 3*, 209-221.

Corsaro, W.A. & Emiliani, F. (1992) Child care, early education, and children's peer culture in Italy. In: *Child Care in Context. Cross-Cultural Perspectives*, Lamb, M.A. et al. (eds.). Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Corsaro, W.A. & Rizzo, T.A. (1988) Discussion and friendship in the peer culture of Italian nursery school children. In: *American Sociological Review, 53*, p. 879-894.

Fein, G. (1989) Mind, Meaning, and Affect: a Proposal for a Theory of Pretence. In: *Developmental Review, 9*, 345-363.

Goldsmith, H.H. & Alansky, J.A. (1987) Maternal and Infant Temperamental Predictors of Attachment: A Meta-Analytic Review. In: *Journal Of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55*, 805-816.

Hock, E., McBride, S. & Gnezda, M.Th. (1989) Maternal Separation Anxiety: mother-infant separation from the maternal perspective. In: *Child Development, 60*, 793-802.

Homans, E. (1995) Vluchtige kinderen in de groep. Doctoraalonderzoek ontwikkelingspsychologie, Utrecht: Universiteit van Utrecht.

Hutt, S.J., Tyler, S., Hutt, C. & Christopherson, H. (1989) *Play, Exploration and learning. A natural history of the pre-school.* London: Routledge.

Kessen, W. (1983) The American Child and Other Cultural Inventions. In: Kessel, F. & Siegel, A. (eds.), *The Child and Other Cultural Inventions*, Houston Symposium, nr. 4, New York.

Landsted, O. (1994) Looking at Quality from the Child's Perspective. In: *Valuing Quality in Early Childhood Services. New approaches to defining quality.* Moss, P. & Pence, A. (eds.). London: Paul Chapman Publ. Ltd.

Larner, M. & Phillips, D. (1994) Defining and Valuing Quality as a Parent. In: *Valuing Quality in Early Childhood Services. New approaches to defining quality.* Moss, P. & Pence, A. (eds.). London: Paul Chapman Publ. Ltd.

Melhuish, E.C. & Moss, P. (1991) *Day Care for Young Children. International Perspectives.* London: Routledge.

Moss, P. & Pence, A. (eds.) (1994) *Valuing Quality in Early Childhood Services. New approaches to defining quality.* London: Paul Chapman Publ. Ltd.

Musatti, T. & Mueller, E. (1985) Expressions of representational growth in toddlers' peer communication. In: *Social Cognition, 3*, p.383-399.

Penn, H. (1994) Working in Conflict: Developing a Dynamic Model of Quality. In: *Valuing Quality in Early Childhood Services. New approaches to defining quality.* Moss, P. & Pence, A. (eds.). London: Paul Chapman Publ. Ltd.

Phillips, D.A., Scarr, S. & McCartney, K. (1987) Dimensions and effects of child-care quality: the Bermuda study. In: Phillips, D.A.(ed.), *Quality in Child Care: What Does Research Tell Us?* 43-56. Washinton DC: NAEYC.

Rheingold H.L. (1982) Little children's participation in the work of adults, a nascent prosocial behavior. In: *Child Development, 53*, 114-125.

Rubenstein, J. & Howes, C. (1983) Social-emotional development of toddlers in day care: the role of peers and of individual differences. In: Kilmer, S.(ed.), *Advances in Early Education and Day Care, III.* Greenwich: JAI Press.

Singer, E. (1991) *Kijk op kinderopvang. Ervaringen van ouders.* Utrecht: Van Arkel.

Singer, E. (1992) *Child-Care and the Psychology of Development.* London/New York: Routledge.

Singer, E. (1993) Shared care for Children. In: *Theory and Psychology, 3*, 429-449.

Singer, E. & Miltenburg, R. (1994) Quality in Child day Care Centres: How to Promote it? In: *Early Child Development and Care, 102*, 1-16.

Swaders, E. (1995) *Het kinderopvang Plus Project: een onderzoek naar het sociale functioneren van Kinderopvang Plus-Kinderen.* Doctoraalonderzoek ontwikkelingspsychologie, Utrecht: Universiteit van Utrecht.

Stambok, M. & Verba, M. (1986) Organization of social play among toddlers: an ecological approach. In: *Process and outcome in peer relationships.* Mueller, E.C. &. Cooper, C.R (eds.). New York: Academic Press.

Tari, A., Hancock, S. & Brophy, K. (1989) Factors to be considered in integrated programs for young children: a review. In: *Early Child Development and Care, 53*, 37-46.

Tizard, B. & Hughes, M. (1984) *Young children learning.* Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Van Dijke, A., Terpstra, L. & Hermanns, J. (1994) *Ouders over kinderopvang. Een onderzoek naar meningen, ervaringen, wensen en keuzes van mannen en vrouwen.* Amsterdam: SCO.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1976) Play and its role in the mental development of the child. In: *Play, its role in development and evolution.* Bruner, J.S., Jolly, A. & Sylva, F. (eds.). Harmonsworth: Penquin.